



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,364	05/11/2001	Michael A. Brundridge	M-11598 US	1288

23640 7590 01/28/2004

BAKER BOTTS, LLP  
910 LOUISIANA  
HOUSTON, TX 77002-4995

EXAMINER
----------

MCCARTHY, CHRISTOPHER S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2113

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/854,364

Applicant(s)

BRUNDRIDGE ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher S. McCarthy

Art Unit

2113

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by  
Snover U.S. Patent 6,438,716.

As per claim 1, Snover teaches a method of detecting and reporting failures in a computer comprised of assigning one or more alpha numeric designated event codes exclusively to particular failure events (column 8, lines 17-30); detecting the particular failures in a device of the computer (column 1, lines 55-59); storing the exclusively assigned event codes of the detected particular failures in an error log (column 8, lines 17-30); parsing the error log for the stored event codes if the event codes compare to one or more determined values (column 8, line 54 – column 9, line 3; column 5, lines 60-65); and relating the parsed event codes to one or more frequently asked question (FAQ) files (column 7, lines 19-21; column 8, lines 19-21; column 1, lines 16-20).

As per claim 2, Snover teaches the method of detecting and reporting failures in a computer of claim 1 further comprised of presenting to a user the FAQ files (column 2, lines 20-21).

As per claim 3, Snover teaches the method of detecting and reporting failures in a computer of claim 1 wherein the error log is further parsed for redundant event codes (column 5, lines 60-65; column 9, lines 4-9).

As per claim 4, Snover teaches the method of detecting and reporting failures in a computer of claim 2 further comprising of providing customized pages related to the FAQ files to the user comprised of creating a template (column 8, line 66 – column 9, line 3); inputting into the template relevant content from the error log; and masking out non relevant content from the template (column 7, lines 1-9).

As per claim 6, Snover teaches a computer system comprising of a processor (column 3, lines 34-36); computer readable medium coupled to the processor (column 4, lines 1-4); and computer code, encoded in the computer readable medium, configured to cause the processor to assign one or more alpha numeric designated event codes exclusively to particular failure events (column 8, lines 17-30); detect the particular failures in a device of the computer (column 1, lines 55-59); store the exclusively assigned event codes of the detected particular failures in an error log (column 8, lines 17-30); parse the error log for the stored event codes if the event codes compare to one or more determined values (column 8, line 54 – column 9, line 3; column 5, lines 60-65); and relate the parsed event codes to one or more frequently asked question (FAQ) files (column 7, lines 19-21; column 8, lines 19-21; column 1, lines 16-20).

As per claim 7, Snover teaches the computer system of claim 6 wherein the processor is further configured to present to a user the FAQ files (column 2, lines 20-21).

As per claim 8, Snover teaches the computer system of claim 6 wherein the error log is further parsed for redundant event codes (column 5, lines 60-65; column 9, lines 4-9).

As per claim 9, Snover teaches the computer system of claim 7 wherein the processor is further configured to provide customized pages related to the FAQ files to the user comprised of creating a template (column 8, line 66 – column 9, line 3); inputting into the template relevant content from the error log; and masking out non relevant content from the template (column 7, lines 1-9).

As per claim 11, Snover teaches a computer program product encoded in computer readable media (column 9, lines 52-58), the computer program product comprising a first set of instructions, executable on a computer system, configured to assign one or more alpha numeric designated event codes exclusively to particular failure events (column 8, lines 17-30); a second set of instructions, executable on the computer system, configured to detect the particular failures in a device of the computer (column 1, lines 55-59); a third set of instructions, executable on the computer system, configured to store the exclusively assigned event codes of the detected particular failures in an error log (column 8, lines 17-30); a fourth set of instructions, executable on the computer system, configured to parse the error log for the stored event codes if the event codes compare to one or more determined values (column 8, line 54 – column 9, line 3; column 5, lines 60-65); and a fifth set of instructions, executable on the computer system, configured to relate the parsed event codes to one or more frequently asked question (FAQ) files (column 7, lines 19-21; column 8, lines 19-21; column 1, lines 16-20).

As per claim 12, Snover teaches the computer program product of claim 1 further comprised of a sixth set of instructions, executable on the computer system, configured to present to a user the FAQ files (column 2, lines 20-21).

Art Unit: 2113

As per claim 13, Snover teaches the computer program product of claim 1 further comprised of a seventh set of instructions, executable on the computer system, configured to parse the error log for redundant event codes (column 5, lines 60-65; column 9, lines 4-9).

As per claim 14, Snover teaches the computer program product of claim 12 further comprised of a eighth set of instructions, executable on the computer system, configured to provide customized pages related to the FAQ files to the user comprised of creating a template (column 8, line 66 – column 9, line 3); inputting into the template relevant content from the error log; and masking out non relevant content from the template (column 7, lines 1-9).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 10, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snover in view of Machiraju et al U.S. Patent 6,243,090.

As per claim 5, Snover does teach the method of detecting and reporting failures in a computer of claim 4. Snover does not explicitly teach wherein the FAQ files and the template are written in HTML. Machiraju does teach wherein the FAQ files and the template are written in HTML (column 1, lines 42-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the HTML programming of Machiraju to the files and templates of Snover. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine

Art Unit: 2113

the HTML programming of Machiraju to the files and templates of Snover because Machiraju teaches the use of HTML-based FAQ's that can be exported by hyperlink to other locations over the Internet, a desire explicitly expressed in Snover in column 9, lines 50-51.

As per claim 10, Snover teaches the computer system of claim 9. Snover does not explicitly teach wherein the FAQ files and the template are written in HTML. Machiraju does teach wherein the FAQ files and the template are written in HTML (column 1, lines 42-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the HTML programming of Machiraju to the files and templates of Snover. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the HTML programming of Machiraju to the files and templates of Snover because Machiraju teaches the use of HTML-based FAQ's that can be exported by hyperlink to other locations over the Internet, a desire explicitly expressed in Snover in column 9, lines 50-51.

As per claim 15, Snover teaches the computer program product of claim 14. Snover does not explicitly teach wherein the FAQ files and the template are written in HTML. Machiraju does teach wherein the FAQ files and the template are written in HTML (column 1, lines 42-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the HTML programming of Machiraju to the files and templates of Snover. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the HTML programming of Machiraju to the files and templates of Snover because Machiraju teaches the use of HTML-based FAQ's that can be exported by hyperlink to other locations over the Internet, a desire explicitly expressed in Snover in column 9, lines 50-51.

***Conclusion***

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 6,128,017 to Alimpich et al.

U.S. Patent 6,542,897 to Lee

U.S. Patent 5,892,989 to Fujii et al.

U.S. Patent 6,526,529 to Mikovsky et al.

U.S. Patent 5,463,768 to Cuddihy et al.


U.S. Patent Application Publication US2003/0028448A1

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher S. McCarthy whose telephone number is (703)305-7599. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (703)305-9713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

csm  
January 15, 2003

  
ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 21



Application/Control Number: 09/854,364

Art Unit: 2113

Page 8